APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,629	01/24/2000	Richard H. Lamb	201385	6064

			EXAMINER
7590	01/24/2005		VU, THONG H

Phillip M Pippenger
Leydig Voit & Mayer Ltd
Two Prudential Plaza Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, IL 60601-6780

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Advisory Action	**Application No.**	**Applicant(s)**
		09/489,629	LAMB ET AL.
		Examiner	**Art Unit**	-
		Thong H Vu	2142	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *see attach*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1-33*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/01/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claim 1, applicant argues the prior art does not teach

(a) at the gateway computing device receiving handshaking packets from the client machine having as a destination address the destination server;

(b) redirecting network communications at the gateway computing device,

redirecting the handshaking packets by rewriting the destination address in the handshaking packets' IP headers to route the packets to an access controlling web server that is remote from the client, the gateway, and the destination server;

receiving a content request packet from the client machine at the gateway destined for the destination server intended to retrieve the desired resource from the destination server;

at the gateway redirecting the content request packet by rewriting the destination address in the packet IP header to route the packet to the access controlling web server;

(c) receiving a response at the gateway from the access controlling web server;

(d) at the gateway, controlling access of the client machine to the desired resource based on the response from the access controlling web server, including refusing the client machine access to the desired resource if the response from the access controlling web server indicates that the client should not have access to the desired resource and granting the client machine access

to the desired resource if the response from the access controlling web server indicates that the client should have access to the desired resource.

Examiner points out the prior art taught (a) at the gateway computing device receiving handshaking packets from the client machine having as a destination address with the destination server [Gelman. Gateway, server col 7 lines 10-38; destination address, col 10 lines 9-21; handshake packets, col 29 lines 34-47];

(b) redirecting network communications [Gelman, redirect rules, col 18 lines 34-52; col 19 line 50-col 20 line 7;col 21 lines 27-38;col 23 line 57-col 24 line 37;col 29 lines 1-15], including the steps of:

redirecting the handshaking packets by rewriting the destination address in the handshaking packets IP headers to route the packets to an access controlling web server that is remote from the client, the gateway, and the destination server [Gelman, redirect rules, col 18 lines 34-52; col 19 line 50-col 20 line 7;col 21 lines 27-38;col 23 line 57-col 24 line 37; the TCP three-way handshake, col 29 lines 1-15. It was obvious that the Redirect rule allows the destination address changed/translated to destination address, col 10 lines 9-21];

receiving a content request packet from the client machine at the gateway destined for the destination server intended to retrieve the desired resource from the destination server [Gelman, the intended destination node, col 8 lines 42-50];

at the gateway redirecting the content request packet by rewriting the destination address in the packet IP header to route the packet to the access

control web server [Gelman, gateway changes (i.e.: rewrite) the ports in header

(i.e.: the destination packet) to route the packet to the destination node or web

server, col 9 lines 17-33];

(c) receiving a response at the gateway from the access controlling web server

[Gelman, Gateway connected to server, col 12 lines 49-57]; and

(d) at the gateway, controlling access of the client machine to the desired

resource based on the response from the access controlling web server [Gelman,

determines whether to send an ARQ message based on sequence numbers of

messages received, col 37 lines 4-9], including refusing the client machine access to

the desired resource if the response from the access controlling web server indicates

that the client should not have access to the desired resource and granting the client

machine access to the desired resource if the response from the access controlling web

server indicates that the client should have access to the desired resource [Gelman, a

Firewall with authentication and packet filtering would allow a client access to the

desired resources based on the access right of the clients, col 32 lines 1-22].

Thus, the prior art taught all limitations in the claim language. Therefore, the

rejection is sustained.

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142